



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,277	06/20/2003	George E. Barringer JR.	3551.1002-000	6447

21005 7590 04/06/2009
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER

JARRETT, LORE RAMILLANO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1797

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/06/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/601,277	Applicant(s) BARRINGER, GEORGE E.	
	Examiner LORE JARRETT	Art Unit 1797	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) LORE JARRETT. (3) JAMES SMITH.

(2) SUMEDHA BAHRI. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 01 April 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: Ms. Bahri gave a brief overview of the claimed invention.

Claim(s) discussed: 22, 50, 68, and 69.

Identification of prior art discussed: BURSHTEYN AND SPARKS.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representatives, Ms. Bahri and Mr. Smith, argued that the prior art did not read on the claimed limitations recited in claims 22, 50, 68, and 69. In particular, Ms. Bahri argued that the prior art of record did not disclose directing a liquid across the filter(s) in a direction opposite to the direction of filtration. Examiner recommended that such arguments should be filed to be made of record and that she will consider such arguments.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/LORE JARRETT/ Examiner, Art Unit 1797	
---	--